

# The Republican.

No. 15, Vol. 3.] LONDON, FRIDAY, AUGUST 4, 1820. [PRICE 6D.

## A LETTER TO ROBERT STEWART, COMMONLY CALLED LORD CASTLEREAGH.

Fain would they confound licentiousness in morals with liberty in thought, and make the libertine resemble his direct opposite.

*Shaftesbury's Characteristics.*

MY LORD,

I shall indulge you with this epithet, as a matter of courtesy, but not a sense of duty or right. I submit to the point of courtesy, because, your lordship has, in the course of the last week, given me cause to be in a much better humour with you, than I have generally been. I mean by your lordship's avowing yourself a regular subscriber to my Republican, and your "*puff direct*" upon it, in the lower house of parliament. It was the very thing that the Republican stood in need of, for since the change of its price from twopence to sixpence (your lordship thinking it disrespectful to the press, that any thing should be printed and sold at so low a price as twopence, and, in the goodness of your heart, sympathizing with us poor garreteers in not being sufficiently rewarded for our exertions;) and since my confinement in this distant part of the country, it has not been generally known that the Republican has been extant and continued. Your lordship I presume must have had some knowledge of this, and from your approbation of its contents, you resolved to give it such a puff as would have cost me 100l. even if I had overcome the scruples of the editors of the different newspapers to insert an advertisement of such a description. Your lordship is a most excellent reviewer, you hit on just such passages for comment, as I should have pointed out to you if you had asked

VOL III. No. 15.

Printed and Published by J. CARLILE, 55, Fleet Street.

my advice, and had consulted my wishes, and in return, my lord, when it becomes your lot to *stand prostrate*, to *turn your back on yourself*, or become a *contrast to yourself*, I will remember what you have done for me in this instance, and if I cannot use sufficient influence to get you employed as a critic and a reviewer of books, in an established magazine or review, I will certainly, out of my high consideration for your Lordship, start one myself, for the very purpose. The world is thoroughly satiated with your political and diplomatic talent, you have risen to the acme of splendour in each of those pursuits, and as satiety is apt to glut, and to create a dislike to the continuation of a sameness however beneficial, this new project of mine will still continue your lordship as the pole of attraction, if not as a politician and a diplomatist, yet as the first of critics and of literary characters. And as philosophy is the most pleasing attainment to lead us cheerfully down the vale of life, who knows but that same illimitable capacity which has raised you to be the greatest of politicians and diplomatists, may enable you to quit the stage of life, as the greatest of past and present philosophers.

In perusing what I have written, I feel satisfied that your lordship, at least, will say, that I have done you justice in my commencement or preface of my letter. Should I, in the course of other observations which I have to offer to your lordship, fall off into one of my old humours with you, and forget the benefits I have so lately received at your hands, I must entreat your lordship to borrow the charitable feeling of Sidmouth, Wilberforce, and brother Vansittart, and attribute my ingratitude to human frailty, rather than perverseness.

I have been long looking for a becoming opportunity to address myself to your lordship; but as I have learnt that good manners is the best part of policy, I was unwilling to address myself to you without a fair opportunity; as intrusion can never be said to enjoy a welcome. I consider your lordship's late zeal in my cause, and on my particular behalf, fully to have warranted this my present address, and now I have, as the folks say, broken the ice, I shall endeavour in what I have now to advance, to assume that natural boldness which has brought me from the mechanics bench to the writing desk, and your lordship, the mere grandson of a Scotch Pedlar, to be a Secretary of State for foreign affairs. As I have mentioned your office as Secretary of State for foreign affairs, I will just, by the way, observe, that if you have never rendered yourself a *contrast to yourself*, you have been a contrast to



your office whilst in that office: for instead of abiding at home and attending to the foreign affairs of this nation, you have gone abroad for no other purpose than to distract by foreign treaties, congresses, and alliances, the domestic affairs of this and every other in Europe. Having made a confession of the causes of my own native boldness, I will endeavour to shew your lordship the grounds on which I have put that of yours in competition with it, and in doing this I shall have to go back a considerable distance, and take the commencement of your political career into the question for discussion. And here your lordship will again see the direful effects of the licentious press, for, although you are old enough to be my father, still I am old enough, by the assistance of this licentious press, to trace back your deeds to the period of my infancy. As I am at all times anxious not to be misunderstood in what I write or speak, so also, I shall in this, attempt to say what Lord Castlereagh has been, is at present, and may be; study to be as brief, laconic, and explicit as possible.

In the outset of your political career, we found you pledging yourself to your constituents by a test, that you would study and make it your duty to reform the abuses of the state. This test was written, signed and presented to your constituents, and this at a moment when Ireland was labouring under the most odious and tyrannical system. But it somehow happened, that your lordship was scarcely known as a member of the Irish Parliament, before you had laid aside your test; and had been selected as the man above all others that was fit to support the abuses of the system of the Irish government. This discernment on the part of your employers must have been in consequence of that native boldness which I have before mentioned in your lordship, and which boldness, if it happen to be applied to patriotic and useful objects, must infallibly be of great benefit to the nation, but if on the other hand, it is the property of a base and dishonest man, and that man, like your lordship, gets into power over others, he is sure to become a most grievous pest, and to blast the bloom of what little prosperity and happiness may be in existence. This we have seen fully verified both in your lordship's career in Ireland and in this country as well. In Ireland, your lordship had not filled the office of secretary many months, before the whole country was in a state of insurrection from aggravated oppressions, exactions, and misrule. Here at once your lordship's native disposition was called into full exercise, here your lordship became gratified

with a military government worse than ever disgraced the soil of Asia, or Africa, or Spanish America. Here your lordship could sit in your office in the castle of Dublin, and witness the rising and falling of the lash, hear the groans of the mangled, smile at the outrage of humanity, and pride yourself on having invented an improvement upon torture. Your pitch-caps and bowel-flagellations were a refinement upon every thing that had been practised in the continental inquisitions, and what is still more outrageous, your lordship's native boldness enabled you to set aside all qualms of conscience, and to make public exhibitions of these barbarous atrocities. Having reduced Ireland to a state of debility by draining its life-blood in flagelations, in secret assassinations, and in every such like pursuit as could gratify the most insatiate monster, your lordship began to look out for a new sphere of action. England was the soil which seemed to attract your lordship's attention, and lest you should lose the opportunity of wreaking vengeance on the last remains of honest feeling in Ireland, you produced the annihilation of its parliament, and made it a mere tributary province to that country and government, in which you have found room to extend the destructive powers of your appetite. Having filled Ireland with disconsolate widows and parentless orphans, your lordship crosses the channel to find further room to display the depravity of human nature, when it is swayed over men who tacitly submit to an usurpation of government, and consent to be slaves from habit and ignorance. A congenial feeling soon arises between your lordship and the reigning monarch of England, that attachment, which is calculated to procure best and to the greatest extent the objects of choice, soon entwined your bosom into that of your master, and procured for you an illimitable discretion. You were the man above all others to feed the sanguinary disposition of your master, and to keep up an indiscriminate carnage of the human race, for no other object whatever, than that you might triumph in the assertion that you had spilled more blood than any previous despot, and had swayed the wills of a greater portion of mankind than any predecessor.

The interests of Ireland you have both distracted and ruined for the present, and now you sigh to play exact the same game in England. You have nearly approached a similar climax, and common rumour says, that if you had any further place of refuge, where you could repeat the same game, the tragedy would soon be brought to a conclusion and the cur-



tain of Britain drop never to be removed during the life-time of Castlereagh. My lord, we, the people of Great Britain, know to a certainty, that you have frequently expressed a wish to sabre them when assembled in public meetings, and I, for one, believe that you secretly instigated the Magistrates of Manchester to perpetrate those atrocities of the 16th of August last. On the occasion of the Spa-fields meeting, you made a similar proposition to the cabinet, pledging yourself as the responsible person for it; but fortunately your colleagues thought that the tragedy would be performed too near home, and that it might, when began, be apt to reach themselves. This has been the sole ground that has prevented a carnage in London; your lordship never dreaded the consequences, because it would have restored you to your native element, and like Nero, you would have fiddled amidst the fire of our houses and the flowing of our blood. But still the power remains in your hands, and it is more than probable, that the picture which I have exhibited as practised in Ireland, and the conjecture of its repetition in England, might be realized, and at no very distant day. You hold the ingredients of this disastrous plague, and we have too much cause to fear that you anxiously seek the opportunity to scatter them. It is surprising to hear your lordship in parliament talk about the attempts to bring about a revolution in this country, whilst, at the same time, you have been the chief instrument in disorganizing every thing that was stable, and fomenting the elements of change and convulsion. That the stamina of revolution are prepared in this country I have no doubt, and still less doubt, that your lordship has been one of the main causes of that preparation. You are the main-spring of the government of this country, and although the lesser causes of motion may in some measure tend to check you, still you must finally prevail over them, and guide them by your own strength and influence. Having taken this cursory view of your political career, I come now to consider that in a diplomatic point of view.

Your first step, I believe, happened at the close of the career of Napoleon Buonaparte; but I shall pass over all minor matters, and come at once to the Congress of Vienna, and the subsequent one at *Aix-la-Chapelle*. It was at Vienna that your Lordship prided yourself with the idea of holding the helm of the Continent; and this appears most conspicuously, when you could venture, after the close of that business, to set your foot on the soil of Ireland, and to toast it as the birth-

place of the ablest of Statesmen, and of Generals!—meaning, of course, yourself, as the ablest of Statesmen! It was at Vienna that your Lordship convinced the despots of Europe, that the English government was willing to accede to their system of misrule, and to check the further progress of liberty and knowledge, you returned from Vienna, decked with ribbons, and laden with *snuff-boxes*, and elated with the idea, that you would soon establish the Inquisition, the torture, a censorship over the press, and an absolute monarchy, with an immense standing army, in Britain. You never, for a moment, thought that the nation would require a system of the strictest economy, to recover the dilapidations of so many years of war; but, on the contrary, you must have an increased splendour, an increased taxation, and an increased army, to silence the moans of public distress.—You have rendered the mind of the monarch as imbecile as that of an infant; and now you find that you can best amuse it with a few dressed dolls, a whistle, and a rattle, and an army in miniature, manufactured out of wood, and painted agreeable to his Majesty's taste. At the Congress of Vienna, not one step was taken for ameliorating the condition of mankind, but the whole time was spent in dissecting the Continent, and placing its several inhabitants under that despot which could best controul them, and conform to a settled plan of domination. Thus, we find Italy, and Venice, and Genoa, and Piedmont, brought under the influence and lash of the despot of Austria, lest the rule of a new monarch should impress the idea of a new system. Although Murat was not expelled from Italy and Naples at the moment that the Congress was sitting, still it is unquestionable, that his destruction was there planned, and thence put into execution. Buonaparte interrupted the sittings of Vienna, and caused the close of those hellish deliberations to take place at *Aix-la-Chapelle*. The result was, that France should be fettered with an immense foreign army, and every effort used to erase the memory of the revolution. The present King of Sweden, the child of Buonaparte, was then, and is still looked on, with a very jealous eye; and it is unquestionable, that a scheme is prepared to expel him from the Swedish throne, as the last emblem of the French revolution, and to replace the son of Gustavus Adolphus, the former king. Should the progress of revolution be less tardy than is now to be hoped, on the Continent, the death of the late King of Sweden, will be the signal for the expulsion of, what then we shall hear called, the usurper. At this last place of conference,



to consolidate the measures agreed on, was formed the Holy Alliance—the purport of which was, as we have since had practical proof, to encourage the progress of fanaticism in the public mind, the better to enslave the body. Perhaps no men know the causes and effects of liberty better than despots. As it is, the enemy which they have to cope with, forms a prominent part of their studies. They know it, and dread it, and instinctly avow perpetual war with it. But it is satisfactory to reflect, that the *semen* of revolution had taken such deep root throughout the Continent, that it has sprung up first in the most neglected, and the least suspected parts. There, where no efforts had been apparently used to crush it, and uproot it, has it shot forth, and promises an abundant harvest. The Army of Observation is scattered, and the military of each country begin to forsake their despot, and to combine with their friends and brothers, the people. Although man is within himself a machine, still it appears, that a body of enlightened men, are not to be made a machine for the use and abuse of a despot's will. The example of revolt is given. Spain and Naples have proved the experiment successful; and the choice of liberty or slavery is held out to the rest of Europe. Embrace it, soldiers!—and learn that the base of your prosperity depends on your affection with a people—and not with a despot!

Scarcely had the holy alliance time sufficient to unfold itself, than revolution has struck at its root, and made this *herbane* wither like a leaf in October. Its pestiferous sap, instead of infecting, has only strengthened the precautions against infection, and that which was intended as a destructive poison to the growth of liberty, has been converted to a nourishing remedy in preserving and propagating it. Thus far my lord all your efforts for the future seem blasted, you have most assiduously cultivated the growth of despotism, but the season and the climate has been unfavourable to your crop. I should not have said crop, because, it has been destroyed in the blade. What intend you to do now my lord? Will you summon another congress—will you stir up a continual war in imitation of your predecessor Pitt, or will you shrink from the blast and play the coward, because you are in an extremity? Go on my lord, finish well the good work so well begun. Your lordship has not yet studied philosophy, you have not trod the realm of metaphysics, and travelled from causes to effects. Had your lordship studied philosophy before you had entered on your career of diplomacy, you would have not laid

down causes which should produce opposite effects to those wished for and intended. You have built your house on the sand, which the storm of winter shall sweep away. All your ribands—all your snuff-boxes, will be to you but monuments of your folly and wickedness, and when they tarnish like your fame, will cease to amuse you, and to give consolation to a vacant and distracted mind. Go on, noble lord; obstinacy even in vice is counted of more repute than a relapsed wavering, and what to you will be still more consoling, that a mind bent and determined on an object is always buoyed up with hope whilst it is in the act of perseverance. Cease not whilst you have life to follow the same career, for what is death and a momentary pain when put in competition with months and years passed in painful regrets and un hoped for relief. It is nothing, my lord, and let not those idle and fanatical qualms of conscience, which are felt by Sidmouth, Wilberforce, Eldon and Vansittart, have any hold in your mind. Have nothing to do with their Bible-clubs, instead of revel routes, and their *religieuse conversationes*, instead of the gay and sprightly dance. Those men will pine and sink under the reverses of fortune, whilst your lordship shall be in good spirits even though the halter be about your neck. Your lordship must substitute that native boldness, which has elevated you to so dangerous a height, for magnanimity, and shew the world, that, although your conduct has the appearance of pusillanimity inflated, you are not the dastard which false greatness too often covers. Let your exit be as splendid and as elevated as your late and present career, that posterity might say, "he died as he lived—the pole of attraction, and under the beam of glory."

I come now to consider the observations which your lordship lately made in parliament, and more particularly those which related to the publication containing this letter.

In opening this subject, your lordship is made to say by the newspaper's report, "that nothing could be more painful to a well regulated mind, than to observe the extreme length to which the press had gone in discussions on this subject." Perhaps your lordship considers, that only to be a well regulated mind, which is at your lordship's controul, such as those members of the Common's House, which Mr. Brougham has lately designated as hounds. Without doubt it would be very satisfactory to your lordship, and draw forth your encomiums, if you could in the same manner regulate the minds of the whole community as you do the majority of that House, whe-



ther drunk or sober. I was most agreeably surprized to see your lordship bring forward any observation of mine to corroborate your assertions with respect to the press, because it has ever been my object to write in such a stile, that the full and unambiguous force of it might be felt where it was applied. I claim it as a proof of the veracity of my assertions, that your lordship has noticed them in that House. It is the truth only which your lordship and your colleagues are alarmed at, we may fill our pages with falsehood as long as we can hold a pen, and we should then find your lordship applaud what you call the well regulated mind which sways the press. According to your idiom, that is the well regulated mind which supports the abuses and corruptions amidst which you thrive and flourish, and agreeable to that idiom, to write the truth and expose those abuses and corruptions, is licentiousness. However, for my own part, being now convinced, that what I have lately written has reached and wrung your lordship's feelings, I shall find encouragement to pursue the same line, for to me your lordship's observations are a sufficient satisfaction, that I have "hit the right nail," and that I have not been altogether useless in endeavouring to oppose your wishes, to destroy the Queen. I now beg leave to say, or rather repeat, that I have not espoused her cause as the Queen of England, it is sufficient for me that I see her a persecuted woman, and that I know her persecutor or persecutors to be most abandoned villains—wretches in the human form—knaves and scoundrels among whom to be virtuous is to be offensive, and to incur wrath and punishment.

I cannot help giving it to your lordship as my calm opinion, that you evince the badness of your cause, in endeavouring to cover such a paragraph as appeared in *Flyndell's Western Luminary*, and to protect its author from the punishment which commonly awaits a notice of that kind in the House of Commons. It is a maxim in all our courts of law, that a man shall not plead the similar conduct of others as a justification for his own offence; but this maxim has lately, on many occasions, been controverted in the House of Commons; but in no instance so glaring as that in which your lordship has been a *particeps criminis*. What a wide difference do the opposite paragraphs display, when contrasted with each other. The paragraph which your lordship supported, and screened its author from punishment, was a false and direful attack, to those who might not have the opportunity of knowing it to be

a falsehood, on a persecuted woman; on a woman in danger of her life; and what is still worse, her honour and chastity; on a woman against whom the malice and influence of the monarch and all his adherents are called into exercise; on a woman who has been prejudged by her judges, and who is to be tried by her accusers. If your lordship had been anxious, as you have falsely asserted, that the Queen should have fair play, you would have seconded the motion of Mr. Wetherell, and left the other paragraphs to the attention of the Attorney-General; but by shielding Mr. Flyndell, on the ground that on the other side there had appeared paragraphs as bad, was a conduct as puerile as it was base. For my own part, my lord, I can say it was to me a matter of regret that you did not put in the numbers of the Republican for the animadversion of the House. I began to read the proceedings with an indescribable joy, but it relapsed into sorrow when I found how it ended. I do not consider that Mr. Wetherell did his duty fully and fairly, to withdraw his motion, and I do not thank him for keeping me from the bar of the House. I would have supported my assertions in your lordship's face, and the face of the House; you should have seen that my contempt was somewhat more than arm's length for your honourable House: it is rooted in my bosom; and my tongue should have corresponded with my pen, whatever had been the consequence. I would have shewn you, that that which is in itself dishonourable and corrupt, should not have found the slightest mark of respect emanating from me in any place or character. It was and is a matter of regret to me, that I was deprived of the honor of being brought to the bar of that House by Mr. Wetherell's flinching from inflicting a summary punishment on that barbarous and murderous paragraph in the Exeter Luminary. Such a paragraph is only calculated to injure her Majesty in the minds of those who read no other paper, which is too much the case in the four western counties of England. In London and many other parts of the country, such a paragraph could only be beneficial to the cause of the Queen, and your lordship's support of it is the best proof of the foulness of your cause. As such paragraphs and proceedings ought to be recorded in every publication that issues from the press, I shall combine them in this letter to your lordship, which I think you will not complain of as inappropriate, as they were the cause of the letter. The first is, that which your lordship cherished as a delicious morsel on your side, it is as follows, alluding to the Queen:—" Shall a woman who



is as notoriously devoted to *Bacchus* as to *Venus*—shall such a woman as would, if found on our pavement, be committed to *Bridewell* and whipped—be held up in the light of suffering innocence?" Here my lord stands a *memento* of what sort of fair play your lordship wishes to shew the Queen. The fair play your lordship means, is such as you have witnessed, and ordered, in Ireland; to flog the bowels of a man to make him confess what he knew nothing about, and then let him lay for weeks half putrid, without medical aid. Your lordship has no idea what humanity is, and the only office that you bear qualifications for, is the master of a slave ship. Let us now see what are the paragraphs adduced as a justification of the above: the first is from the Examiner of the 23rd July, as follows:—"This is what a true Commons House would have done; but when that House, for the main part, is composed of venal boroughmongers, grasping placemen, greedy adventurers, and aspiring title-hunters, or the representatives of such worthies,—a body, in short containing a far greater portion of public criminals than public guardians—what can be expected from it, but—just what we have seen it so readily perform." Contrast this paragraph with the above, and say, what analogy is there between them as to the respective merits of the prosecution of the Queen: this last paragraph is a general one, applied to the well known hired and paid mercenaries which compose your lordship's majority in the lower House of Parliament: the former paragraph is an attack on an individual, and that individual a persecuted one, and consequently, whether innocent or guilty, is entitled to the peculiar protection of all but her accusers, and even those, if they are honest men. Let us see what the other paragraphs are, and how they bear on the question: the first is from No. 13 of the Republican as follows: "We have very little hopes that the Divorce Bill will be rejected in such a Parliament as the present, because we know, and have seen, that they are sufficiently profligate and servile to act against the clearest testimony of innocence and right. Still this will matter nothing; the King and Parliament must wipe off the disgrace which has so long hung about themselves, before they can disgrace the Queen in the public mind. The more she suffers, the more will she be endeared to the nation. There never was in England a monarch more suspected or despised, nor a Parliament more notoriously profligate, than at present. Was it not that they hold the purse strings of the nation, they would be kicked out of al

power in a few hours, and fairly swept out of the country. At present their doom is sealed, and the herald approaching with it." Now, my lord, what is there in this paragraph that bears any analogy to Mr. Flyndell's filthy article. I have attacked, I say I, because, although authors and editors are in the habit of degrading themselves to a level with kings in substituting the plural for the singular number, or *we* for *I*: still, although, I have occasionally used this absurd custom, and often because I could venture to speak in a higher tone and with more assurance than in the singular number, I never will be ashamed to avow any thing that my hand has committed to paper, and if your Lordship's Attorney-General thinks proper to prosecute me for any thing which comes from me, he shall have Mrs. Carlile, and every person in her employ, as evidence of my hand-writing and authorship, or I will save him the trouble by admitting it. Prosecutions for libels on church or state, are now a day rather to be desired than to be flinched from. It is become just what a transportation from England to New Holland is, a change for the better. I beg leave to tell your Lordship, that imprisonment, severe as is the nature of mine, is no punishment for me. I repeat that I have attacked the persecutors of the Queen, a party with power and all the power of the country, except what the public voice deprives them of; a set of usurpers whom I knew at the time had the power to crush me for writing what I did, and that merely by a private order:—for those who superintend the management of this prison, are the men for any thing that your Lordship may wish them to do. If I have stated a falsehood in saying that the king and parliament are profligate, I am open to public contempt for the falsehood, and as I derive my daily bread from the will and pleasure of that public, and as those things which they purchase from me are not exactly essential to their support, I must stand or fall in proportion to the truth of my observations and the approbation they may carry with them. But I do say that the King and Parliament are profligate, and if Mr. Flyndell's observation had been applied to the King instead of the Queen it would have been as *true* as it is now *false*. As to the Parliament I cannot speak of what is called the present as I could of the last, but as I look at the majority of them to be one and the same for many years past, I durst say that they are extremely profligate, not only as members of parliament, but as private men, and if the Attorney-Gener-



ral durst file an information against me for this letter, I will bring into the court some of the more decent members of the lower house of parliament, who shall say, that what was called the last parliament, was a disgusting scene of drunkenness and profligacy more so than any former one, that your Lordship's mercenaries would reel into the house at the smack of the whip for them to come and vote, as drunk, as to appear more like beasts than men. It is well known that these tools of your Lordship never attend to the debates of the house, but sit in the gin-shops and wine-vaults contiguous to St. Stephen's chapel, and continue to fuddle for pastime, with your Lordship's pay and the public money, and so as they are at hand when called upon by your Lordship, they know that it is all they have to care about. This is a true picture of what is called the majority of the House of Commons, and I durst challenge your Lordship to call on me for the proof of it.

The second paragraph which you quoted from the *Republican* is in the 12th No. as follows, speaking of the conduct of the House of Lords towards her Majesty:—"It is really nauseous to hear those old jades talking about justice and purity, it is just as if the inmates of a brothel should quarrel amongst themselves which was the most virtuous, and complain of a departure from the paths of virtue and morality." I claim this observation as my own, and consider it as true and praiseworthy, when I look at the treatment her Majesty has received from the House of Lords. The next paragraph which your Lordship quoted is in the same number and is a specimen of that base and paltry shuffling which your Lordship shews when you are hard beset; it is a paragraph quite extraneous and foreign to the subject before the house. It is printed in an article that has no allusion to the Queen or the prosecution against her, it is a general subject on monarchical governments, and not even applied to any particular one; it is thus:—"The earth has groaned under the curse of monarchical governments much too long. Civilization has struggled against it almost in vain; and nature herself, seemed almost to despair of shaking it off. But the monarchical form of government is like every other vice, it will destroy itself in the course of time, even if no opposition be made to it." Your Lordship should have added the next sentence as a particular. "The vices of the English monarchy are evidently precipitating it to a crisis and downfall." What had this last paragraph or the distinct observations on religion to do with the

case of the Queen? Nothing. But it was adopted by your Lordship for the worst and most paltry of purposes! Your Lordship feared that if such a man as Flyndell was punished for such an article, it would deter other scoundrels from supporting your cause, whilst on the other hand you know that the supporters of the Queen hold your threats and menaces in contempt, and even if punishment comes, they can consciously smile at it, and feel that it is more honorable than otherwise. You have to pay your supporters, and if you pay and punish them too it would be rather singular, whilst on the other hand, the supporters of the Queen have nothing to expect but a share of her persecutions, which, I trust that I or mine would be rather proud of than otherwise. I shall for the present take my leave of your Lordship with a request that when you introduce any more numbers of the *Republican* to the honourable house, you will be so good as to leave them on the table, and not half do the business. I may resume my right to address you as a notorious and public character now I have begun, for, although, I have never written a direct letter to you before, I have always considered you the main support of all the miseries and all the abuses which Englishmen have to contend with. I therefore beg to assure your Lordship, that your best friends do not feel a more sincere attachment to your Lordship than I do, and which, I have only to pray for the opportunity of making a further display of it. In hopes of your Lordship's further favors in supporting the *Republican*,

I remain, &c.

R. CARLILE.

*Dorchester Gaol, Aug. 2nd, 1820.*



## STEADY RESOLUTION OF THE QUEEN.—ADDRESSES MUCH MORE IMPORTANT THAN PRAYERS FOR HER.

The steady resolution of the Queen continues to increase the public admiration for her. Addresses pour in from all quarters, in such multitudes, as to preclude our copying them; and all we can now do, is to make a general mention of them. The female address from Nottingham, and the resolutions and address from the inhabitants of Canterbury, are particularly worthy of notice. The Mayor of this latter city made himself a greater fool than the Lord Mayor of London, on this occasion; and no sooner read the requisition for calling the meeting of the inhabitants, than he said, that he himself did not concur in its object, therefore, he should be no party to its proceedings; and so saying, took to his heels and ran away, amidst the hooting, laughter, and disgust of the whole assembly. We hope to see the females continue their addresses, as we really consider them more important than those from the other sex. The Queen might now say to her royal and princely persecutor, "*You are welcome, George, to the prayers of the Priests, as long as I can enjoy the affectionate addresses of the People.*" We know well which of the two will carry her to heaven the soonest; and, consequently, care not what contempt she receives from the King and his Priests, so as the people do not forsake her—of which there is not much danger at present.

It is now currently reported that her Majesty will be present at the examination of the witnesses against her:—one paper, which we have seen, has a paragraph, setting forth, that her Majesty has actually intimated her intention to the House of Lords, and requested their Lordships to provide her a seat in a becoming situation, where she might be enabled to hear distinctly what is urged against her by every witness. We shall rejoice if this be the case, and consider it an equally important step in her behalf, as her dashing from St. Omer's to Dover. If she can face the charges which are to be advanced in the House of Lords, she will not need to bring any families from

Italy to speak in her behalf. Such a thing will be quite unnecessary as no woman guilty of such charges, could face an honest evidence, and assert her innocency. Let us see the Queen in the House of Lords, on the 17th of August, and we care not what is the nature of the evidence against her.

It is worthy of remark, that the prosecution of the charges against her Majesty, will begin on the day following the first anniversary of the Manchester Massacre. It would have been more in character and coincidence, if the 16th had been named as the day. No enquiry has yet been made into these murders, and they seem, amongst members of Parliament, to have passed by unheeded. A whole session has again passed, wherein they have scarcely been mentioned, or what has been said about them has been worse than nothing. Mr. Hunt has called upon the reformers to observe the anniversary of the 16th, as a fast day! Many of them, no doubt, will find it a fast day, and not a voluntary one. Mr. Hunt has pledged himself to put on a suit of black clothes, and to take no other food than bread and water on that day—and further, to spend the day in *prayer*! For our parts, we shall approach very near the mode of diet, as usual, only substituting milk for water; but as for black clothes and prayer, we should consider it more, in reality, a farce than a fast. It is a fanatical notion which might have suited Oliver Cromwell, and his times, very well, but we really feel sorrow to see such a man as Mr. Hunt encouraging such idle whims. Besides, partaking of bread and water, makes it a breakfast! This is like the Catholic priest, who orders his followers to confine themselves to fish, and vegetables, and bread, and cheese, on the Friday—and the abstinence from animal food is, with them, called a fast, but more properly a feast. We will never encourage the people to fast, nor cause them to fast, if we can help it:—we could rather wish them better cheer than they have at present. We would rather say to the reformers:—“Meet in small bodies on that day—make it a day of friendly intercourse and conversation—do not fast nor pray, but cheer each other as well as you can, on the gloominess of the times;—sing patriotic songs—enliven your hearts with future prospects, and swear by the RIGHTS OF MAN, that you will never miss the opportunity to revenge the murders committed at Manchester, on the bodies of the reformers, on



the 16th of August, 1819. We were by no means anxious to oppose the project of Mr. Hunt: we could rather wish to back him in any thing that was rational; but this farce, of a pretended fast, is intolerable, and would be hypocritical, and a disgrace to the reformers of Great Britain. The man that would really and intentionally encourage any species of fanaticism, can be no friend to liberty. Fanaticism and liberty cannot dwell together. Liberty is the power of volition in the mind, sensibly and conscientiously felt; but fanaticism ever destroys that volition, as a subtle poison. Liberty, adopted as a word, without the power of volition, and acting upon that volition, is a shadow, and not a substance. We seek a species of liberty that is substantial, and let the opponents and destroyers of that sacred property, content themselves with the word and the shadow. We do not mean to insinuate any wrong intention towards Mr. Hunt—we have ever, from the first knowledge of him, borne testimony to his political honesty; and as in the bosom of every honest man, so also, we presume, in ours, that opinion of Mr. Hunt has been much strengthened from his conduct, since the morning of the 16th of August last. We heartily wish that he had hit upon some other expedient for the due observation of the ensuing 16th of August, that would have carried more unanimity with it, than black clothes, bread and water, and prayer. For our own parts, we worship neither stocks, stones, or pictures—fetiches, nor crucifixes; therefore, we have nothing to pray to—no idol to address—and in this instance, we find an insurmountable chasm in complying with Mr. Hunt's whim. We have a full recollection of the day; and as Mr. H. (in his Memoirs which are now publishing) has told us, that he has been accustomed to translate Horace and Virgil, we would say to him in the words of the latter,

—“*Quæquæ ipse miserrima vidi,  
Et quorum pars magna fui.*”

By applying which to the Manchester Massacre, we would translate as follows:—

“The horrid scene I did behold,  
And bore the brunt with others bold.”

In this consideration, we trust that we shall not be charged with a want of feeling, as to the importance of the subject. We have felt it—we do now feel it, and we will never cease to seek redress for that outrageous attack on a peaceable assembly. We feel convinced, and boldly speak it, that the reformers have suffered a sufficiency of unjust treatment, to warrant a severe and summary retaliation in the hour of retribution:—and we further presume, that those who are now carrying on their wanton career of persecution against those reformers, must have made up their minds for a rough handling on a future day. To forget and forgive, in this instance, would be cowardice, inhumanity, and want of due fellow-feeling for the present, and late sufferers. The best thing the reformers can do on the 16th of August to annoy their enemies, is, that as many as possible of them should come up to London with addresses to the Queen; it being the last day that she can conveniently receive and attend to answer such addresses. They might also have on the 17th, the honour to act as guards, and to escort her Majesty to the House of Lords! Also, they may go and have a peep at a large military camp, which, it is said, is about to be formed on Blackheath! Let the soldiers and the reformers agree to support the Queen, and she will have nothing to fear then, nor they, neither.

EDITOR.

**ADDRESS OF THE FEMALE INHABITANTS OF NOTTINGHAM,  
WITH HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER.**

“ TO HER MOST GRACIOUS MAJESTY QUEEN CAROLINE.

“ The humble Address of the Female Inhabitants of the Town of Nottingham and its Vicinity.

“ We, your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the female inhabitants of Nottingham, beg leave to congratulate you on your safe arrival in this country, after so long an absence, and to hail you Queen of these Kingdoms!

“ Beloved as you are by a great people, who have long preserved for



you a faith unshaken, we dare not boast an unrivalled attachment; but we can truly say, that amidst this general glow of beating hearts, none are more loyal, none love you better, and none pray oftener for your present and future happiness than the females of Nottingham. When you were far distant we remembered the unhappy Exile; and when the accusers of your honour rung in our ears (as they fondly hoped) the death-bell of your innocence, we never for a moment believed their slanders, but felt at every charge, as we are sure we shall always feel, a more than common indignation.

"You bring with you such powerful recommendations to protection, as no generous bosom can resist—your father is no more—your brother fell in battle—the chief solace of your cares, your amiable daughter, was soon, too soon snatched away—and your great protector, our late venerable Monarch, soon followed her.

"We would not wring anew your feelings, they have been too often wrung; yet when we consider this, we are not surprised that, though you are not defended by the drawn sabres of the military, you are always surrounded by your guards; thus imitating the example of the magnanimous Queen Elizabeth, trusting your defence to a brave people, who will not be deterred by any power under heaven to forsake you in the day of peril. All in whom the spirit of the days of chivalry are not utterly extinct, all who would not immolate the best impulses of our nature on the altar of modern policy, will rally round their Queen, and save her alike from foreign emissaries and spies, and domestic persecutors.

"We desire to assure you of our continued fidelity, and express a hope that ere long, you will defeat the machinations of your enemies, be restored to all the honours of your illustrious station, and that neither sea nor land will again separate you from an admiring people."

[Signed by 7,800 females.]

The following is her Majesty's gracious answer to the Address from the female inhabitants of Nottingham:—

"I should be deficient in sensibility if I had not felt the warmest gratitude, and more than ordinary delight, when I received from the female inhabitants of Nottingham and its vicinity, an Address which is remarkable for the amiable spirit which it breathes, and for the fervour of attachment to my person and rights which it displays. I am proud of being the Queen of women of such generous sentiments; and I am happy to remark that such sentiments indicate an increased and increasing cultivation of the female mind.

"To be conscious that the hearts of so large a portion of my own sex are vibrating with emotions of affection for his Majesty's Royal Consort, that they are sympathizing with her sorrows and deprecating her wrongs, and that her happiness is the object of their pious supplications, cannot but awaken in my breast the most pleasurable sensations. The same spirit of devotedness to the fair fame, to the lawful rights, and to the general interests of a persecuted Queen, which animates the female inhabitants of Nottingham, is, I trust, diffused through a large majority of their countrywomen. They will consider the honour of her Majesty as reflected upon themselves—they will best know how to appreciate the

verations by which I have been harassed, the slanders by which I have been assailed, and the indignities by which I have been oppressed.

"With the most gentle delicacy the female inhabitants of the town of Nottingham and its vicinity have touched those springs of grief in my heart which will ever continue painfully to vibrate at the recollection of the near and dear relatives of whom I have been bereaved, and particularly of that departed saint in whose talents and whose virtues the women have lost a model of the most estimable excellence, and the nation in general a future sovereign, under whose fostering care that liberty would have flourished which gives happiness to the people and security to the throne."

#### Answers of the Queen to the Addresses of the inhabitants of Rochester, Wakefield, and Berwick-upon-Tweed:—

"This loyal, warm, and ingenuous Address entitles the citizens and inhabitants of Rochester to my most cordial thanks. When they make my return to these realms the topic of congratulation and my former departure from England the subject of regret, their joy and their sorrow mingled with my own.

"The affectionate manner in which the citizens and inhabitants of Rochester mention my deceased, most dear and ever lamented relatives, powerfully touches every chord of sensibility in my breast. I still mourn over their graves—but not as one without hope. That beloved daughter of whom I have been bereaved was once my exhilarating delight, and his late revered Majesty my unalterable trust. Had their lives been happily protracted, I should not have now to contend against that malice, and those calumnies, by which I am so rancorously assailed.

"My constitutional rights are, at present, attacked in an unconstitutional manner. If, in this country, the life, the property, and the reputation of the most humble individual are safe within the sanctuary of the laws, surely those laws ought not to be violated on purpose to deprive the Queen of her rank, her title, and her truly legitimate rights.

"If, as a subject, I am answerable to the laws, let those laws be strictly observed in the judicial investigation of my conduct. Let me not, by any proceeding—which if it retains the form of justice, is conceived in the spirit of tyranny—be put at once out of the protecting pale of the law, and the tutelary guardianship of the constitution.

"I have no wish—I can have no wish—to leave this enlightened, this hospitable country. In what other part of the world could I find, or expect to find, a people so affectionate, friends so steady, or a home in which I have so little to fear from the machinations of my enemies."

"I receive with heartfelt satisfaction this loyal and affectionate Address from his Majesty's subjects, inhabitants of the town of Wakefield, and its vicinity. Their sentiments of congratulation on my accession to the high dignity of Queen of these realms, are a proof that their minds have not been unduly influenced by the flagitious calumnies of my persecutors; and I am, at the same time, feelingly alive to their expressions of kind condolence upon the melancholy losses of those near and dear relatives, which I experienced while on the Continent. I am sensible of the indignities with which I have been assailed, not so much because they are disrespectful to myself, as because they are insulting to the



nation; for the nation has been insulted in the late outrages upon the character of its lawful Queen. Though I am attacked by that malice, which hesitates at no falsehood, and by an assumption of power, which seems to spurn all limitation, I feel a cheering confidence of present support, and of eventual triumph in the affections of the people. I have been accused of appealing to popular clamour—but I appeal to nothing but to the good sense and good feeling—to the reason—the morality, and the patriotism of the most enlightened and most respectable portion of the community. If I am condemned without justice, and dethroned against all law, the liberties of every individual will receive a fatal stab; and the character of the highest Judicature will be blasted to the latest posterity. My own personal welfare is of little moment; but I do feel as a Queen for the public welfare, which is deeply implicated in the vindication of my violated rights.—The power which the House of Lords are assuming in their Bill of Pains and Penalties, not only for divorcing his Majesty's Royal Consort, but of dethroning their lawful Queen, may prove in the result productive of an age of misery to the nation. The child that is now at the breast, may live to rue its consequences.—The consciousness of rectitude, of which no Bill of Pains and Penalties can ever deprive me, will support me through all trials; and even though the force of my enemies should, in the end, prove commensurate with their malignity, the people shall never have occasion to reproach me with neglecting their happiness, with betraying their rights, or with relinquishing for one moment, the patriotic magnanimity of the Queen."

"For this loyal and affectionate Address, I feel deeply indebted to the Mayor, Bailiffs, and Burgesses of the Borough of Berwick-upon-Tweed. The ravage which death has made amongst my nearest and most beloved relatives, since I left England, has furnished many arduous trials for my resignation and my fortitude. It is my duty to submit, without fretfulness or impatience, to these and to heavier afflictions, if I have still heavier to endure.

"My many sorrows have been mingled with an infusion of joy, by the enthusiastic delight with which the people hailed my arrival from the Continent. I had been so long absent from England, and so artfully reviled in my absence, that it was supposed I should never return. My return operated like a flash of lightning upon the public mind. Those whom the accumulated slanders of my enemies had caused to hesitate about my rectitude, were instantly struck with a conviction of my integrity. But while my friends exulted with joy, my enemies turned pale with apprehension. The consciousness of their own guilt was aggravated by the irresistible feeling of my innocence. They exhibited a singular picture of malice rendered impotent, and of rage becoming desperate.

"When my enemies found that they could not operate upon my disinterestedness by a bribe, they attempted to shake my courage by a threat. But I derive from the bounty of Heaven, a mind that is at once superior to the calculations of avarice, and to the impressions of fear.

"If I am a subject, I am a subject in a state of immediate proximity to the Sovereign; and certainly I ought not to be placed in a less favourable situation than that of the most humble individual. Every subject,

whatever may be his condition or his rank, is entitled to a fair and open trial, by which his guilt or his innocence may be legally established. To me, such a trial is refused. My demand for it has hitherto been answered only by Green Bags, which perjury has filled, or by Secret Inquisitions, over which malice presides. Every other subject has the benefit of an impartial Jury; and he may object to a certain number of Jurors, whom he may know, or believe to be hostile to himself or partial to his adversary. Can I object to any of my numerous Judges and Jurors? What individual is there who could expect an impartial trial where his adversary could influence the majority of his Judges, either by the fear of loss, or the hope of gain; either by good in possession, or in expectancy?—But are my judges alone without human infirmities? I leave the question to be answered by those, who know what man is; or who have calmly observed the late proceedings in the House of Lords.”

---

### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

---

*Saul*, a Drama: translated from the French of M. De Voltaire, is now published by Mrs. Carlile, and on sale, price 1s. The following most appropriate motto has been selected for it.

“’Tis written in the Hebrew Chronicle,  
How the physicians, leaving pill and potion,  
Prescribed, by way of blister, a young belle,  
When old King David’s blood grew dull in motion.  
And that the medicine answered very well.  
Perhaps ’twas in a different way applied,  
For David lived, but Juan nearly died.”

DON JUAN.

Also price 3d. Milan Commission; or, the Diverting history of Baron Ompteda, coadjutor of great folks, and rival of Bill Soames. By John Gilpin. Motto—

“The Queen’s abus’d by some most villainous knave—  
Some base notorious knave—some scurvy fellow.  
O, heaven! that such companions thou’dst unfold,  
And put in every honest hand a whip,  
To lash the rascal naked through the world.”

Also, (dedicated to the Queen) Divine and Moral Maxims, Rules, Queries, &c. By a Gentleman of Doctor’s Commons. Price 2d.



CONTINUATION OF REPLY TO THE REV. THOMAS HARTWELL HORNE'S PAMPHLET, ENTITLED "DEISM REFUTED."—From p. 504.

---

We pass over some more scraps of the law, for the book of Numbers is composed alternately of some murmuring and slaughter among them, in consequence of Jehovah's treatment, and then a repeated scrap of the law, where he calls them his chosen people, and promises what he will do for them, if they will not worship other gods. The thirty-first chapter introduces us to an horrid and diabolical tale, such as Milton could have never imagined for his pandemonium. Jehovah orders Moses to send out twelve thousand chosen men of the Israelites to destroy the Midianites, because the God of the Midianites had drawn away the affections of the Israelites from him, Jehovah. We are told that they killed all the men with five kings, not omitting poor Balaam, who had done so much for Israel at the peril of his life! They also burnt all the cities and brought away the women, and children, and cattle, captives. We of course shall expect to hear nothing more of the nation of the Midianites after this, for we shall find that there was not a male left, either man or child. Now for a specimen of the character of Moses. 'And Moses and Eleazer the priest and 'all the princes of the congregation, went forth to meet them 'without the camp. And Moses was wroth with the officers 'of the host, with the captains over thousands, and captains 'over hundreds, which came from the battle. And Moses 'said unto them, have ye saved all the women alive? Behold, 'these caused the children of Israel, through the counsel of 'Balaam, to commit trespass against the Lord in the matter of 'Peor, and there was a plague among the congregation of the 'Lord. Now therefore kill every male among the little ones, 'and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with 'him. But all the women children, that have not known a 'man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves." Can any thing be conceived more horrible than this? is not the belief, in such a book as this, as sacred, calculated to fill the mind with the most deadly and brutal notions. Every warrior who destroys the unoffending inhabitants of a town or village,

might justify his conduct by this *sacred* book! Every assassin might say, that his conduct and inclinations were justifiable, or why did Moses order so many innocent persons to be assassinated at the instigation of Jehovah! There is no vice past or present, but what might be justified by scripture arguments and proofs! It is said, that there were 32,000 virgins left to gratify the lust of Moses and the Israelites, and that 312 fell to the lot of the priests!

In the thirty second chapter, we find the children of Reuben and Gad, soliciting Moses for permission to inherit the land which they had conquered on this side of the Jordan, on the ground, that they had an immense number of cattle, and the country was well adapted for them. How are we to reconcile the possession of this immense number of cattle with their late murmuring for want of flesh? When they ate the quails, we might have supposed, that they had not an ox or a sheep amongst them. Moses tells them, that if they will go over the Jordan and assist in conquering the other parts of the land of Canaan, they may return and possess the land they ask: thus shewing, that Jehovah could not do without the assistance of the Reubenites and Gadites.

The remainder of the book of numbers contains nothing to my purpose, or that is worthy of notice, either for or against the argument: merely mentioning the journeys and stages of the Israelites from Egypt to the spot where we now find them, and a few scraps of law relative to the Levites, who are to possess 48 cities in the promised land, I could wish the priests of our day to live altogether in some city or cities, and not scatter themselves all over the country like locusts, eating up the fruits of it. There is not one single ground for imagining that Moses wrote this book of Numbers, as before he is continually mentioned in the third person, and often in such a manner, as being very meek and very angry, that no man could be supposed to write in this manner of himself. Besides, it is by no means consistent with the manners and customs of the East, that a leader should write his own history. He would disdain the office of a scribe.

The book of Deuteronomy, although called the book of Moses, like the four foregoing books, has more the appearance of being the work of a different hand, it contains a summary or recital of what has occurred in the three former books, omitting some things, contradicting others, and adding a few. The authorized translation sets out with a fraud, by saying,



'These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel on 'this side Jordan in the wilderness.' Now Dr. Geddes says, that '*this side Jordan*' is a false translation, and that it should be '*the other side Jordan*.' After mentioning that the Greek translations have it '*the other side*' he says: 'So also our 'first translators, Coverdale, Matthew, Cranmer, and Bishops, 'But our last translators, following the Genevans, changed 'the "other side" into "this side:" and so most moderns; 'fearing that, if the word were rendered otherwise, it would 'be considered as a proof that Moses was not the writer of 'this narrative. Is this an honourable way to obviate objections? In my opinion, the word (original Hebrew) here, is 'one strong proof that the writer lived on the west side of 'the Jordan, and consequently could not be Moses.' I have passed by a variety of objections made by Dr. Geddes, to Moses being the author of these books, but I think that those which I have urged and shall urge, will be found sufficient to explode the notion. I am not over anxious to make an authority of Dr. Geddes, because, although he explodes many received notions about the Pentateuch, still he sometimes pronounces it to be mythological, and at others seems to admit the historical truth of the existence of Moses, and many other things which are related of him. In short, I believe the case to be this; that Dr. Geddes was like many other learned writers, sensible of the fraud which had been so long imposed upon the world, but did not like to speak out fully, because, it was not fashionable and calculated to bring down a degree of odium, if not persecution. Cautious as are the philosophical writings of Bolingbroke, still his lordship was afraid to publish them in his life time. If every learned and enlightened man had spoke out, and published to the world, what he thought and knew about the Bible, it would have long since been treated with universal contempt. The Bible is essential only to the salvation of kings and priests.

The tale in Deuteronomy is very differently told to that which we have passed over, in the first place, there is not the slightest mention made of Mount Sinai in the whole books, but we are here told, that the commandments and statutes were delivered out of Mount Horeb. Now these are represented in Exodus as two different mounts, and are laid down as such in all maps, and as some few miles distant from each other. The book of Exodus and Leviticus represented the conferences between Jehovah and Moses, as taking place on

Mount Sinai, without once mentioning Mount Horeb as the place, the book of Deuteronomy continually mentions Mount Horeb as the place of conference, without the slightest mention of Mount Sinai. Which are we to believe? I say neither.

Again in the first chapter of Deuteronomy, Moses is represented as speaking thus:—

“And I spake unto you at that time, saying, I am not able to bear you myself alone: The Lord your God hath multiplied you, and, behold, ye are this day as the stars of heaven for multitude. (The Lord God of your fathers make you a thousand times so many more as ye are, and bless you, as he hath promised you!) How can I myself alone bear your cumbrance, and your burden, and your strife? Take you wise men, and understanding, and known among your tribes, and I will make them rulers over you. And ye answered me, and said, The thing which thou hast spoken is good for us to do. So I took the chief of your tribes, wise men, and known, and made them heads over you, captains over thousands, and captains over hundreds, and captains over fifties, and captains over tens, and officers among your tribes. And I charged your judges at that time, saying, Hear the causes between your brethren, and judge righteously between every man and his brother, and the stranger that is with him. Ye shall not respect persons in judgment; but ye shall hear the small as well as the great; ye shall not be afraid of the face of man; for the judgment is God's: and the cause that is too hard for you, bring it unto me, and I will hear it. And I commanded you at that time all the things which ye should do.”

Now, without making much scruple about the observation, that the Israelites were that day as the stars of heaven for multitude, because, modern philosophy teaches us, that the number of the stars is infinite, and the Israelites, in the three different numberings which we have passed, had not increased from the time of their coming out of Egypt any thing worth mentioning, I would call the attention of the reader to the above expression of Moses, where he is made to say, that *he* conceived the idea of setting judges and rulers over the people, and of dividing them into companies, whereas in the book of Exodus we were distinctly told, that it was Jethro who made this suggestion to Moses, in consequence of the multitude of business which he (Moses) had to perform. Pray Mr. Horne is this a contradiction?

In the second chapter we shall find another contradiction amounting to, what is vulgarly called, a lie, in the following words:—



"And I sent messengers out of the wilderness of Kedemoth unto Sihon king of Heshbon with words of peace, saying, Let me pass through thy land: I will go along by the high way, I will neither turn unto the right hand nor to the left. Thou shalt sell me meat for money, that I may eat; and give me water for money, that I may drink: only I will pass through on my feet; (As the children of Esau which dwell in Seir, and the Moabites which dwell in Ar, did unto me;) until I shall pass over Jordan into the land which the Lord our God giveth us. But Sihon king of Heshbon would not let us pass by him: for the Lord thy God hardened his spirit, and made his heart obstinate, that he might deliver him into thy hand, as appeareth this day."

Now the words which we find between the parenthesis are evidently false, because, in the book of Numbers, chap. 20., we were told, that the people of Edom positively refused to let the Israelites pass through their land, and that they came out armed to oppose them, and that the Israelites went round another way; and as for the Moabites, we were told that Sihon the king of the Amorites had rooted them out, before the Israelites came up. With respect to Sihon king of the Amorites, Jehovah is represented as playing one of his Egyptian tricks with him, by first directing Moses to ask leave of him to pass through his land, and then hardening his heart so as to make him refuse it!

In the eleventh verse of the third chapter we have the following words:—

"For only Og king of Bashan remained of the remnant of giants; behold, his bedstead was a bedstead of iron; is it not in Rabbath of the children of Ammon? nine cubits was the length thereof, and four cubits the breadth of it, after the cubit of a man."

I have nothing particular to offer of my own on this verse, but shall introduce a quotation made by Dr. Adam Clarke, from the Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel on Numbers 21, 35, and 36, it is said,

'That Og having observed that the camp of the Israelites extended six miles, he went and tore up a mountain six miles in its base, and put it on his head, and carried it towards the camp, that he might throw on the Israelites and destroy them: but the word of the Lord prepared a worm, which bored a hole in the mountain over his head, so that it fell down upon his shoulders; at the same time, his teeth growing out in all directions, stuck into the mountain, so that he could not cast it off his head. Moses (who was himself ten cubits high) seeing Og thus entangled, took an ax ten cubits long, and having leaped ten cubits in height, struck Og on the ankle-bone, so that he fell, and was slain. From this account, the distance from

' the sole of Og's foot to his *ankle* was *thirty* cubits in length! I give this as a slight specimen of Rabbinical comment. I could quote places from the Talmud, in which Og is stated to be several miles high! This relation about Og, I suppose to be also an historical note, added by a subsequent hand."

This is the first doubt that I have met with in Dr. Adam Clarke's commentary, he has swallowed every thing so far as the word of God; and why not the story about Og? I am not so profane as the doctor upon this subject, I will admit the whole story of Og and all the Rabbinical comments to be the *true* word of Jehovah, but I am rather at a loss to imagine by what means Moses escaped from the mountain which Og had on his shoulders, when he fetched him down by a blow on the ankle-bone.

The mountain must have fallen with Og, as his teeth had made it a fixture; and Moses must have been three miles at least under the mountain! Dr. Geddes says that the *iron bedstead* of Og should have been translated *coffin*, which is more probable. Dr. Adam Clarke supposes that the bedstead was made of iron to prevent the bugs from penetrating it, and harbouring in it! The latter Doctor has made a sad botch of his commentary on this chapter.

In the thirteenth and fourteenth verses of this chapter we have the following words:—

"And the rest of Gilead, and all Bashan, being the kingdom of Og, gave I unto the half tribe of Manassah; all the region of Argob, with all Bashan, which was called the land of giants. Jair the son of Manasseh took all the country of Argob unto the coasts of Geshuri and Maachathi: and called them after his own name, Bashan-havoth-jair, unto this day."

On those verses I have merely to mention, that from the three last words "*unto this day*," it is evident that Moses could not have written them, because it was but a very few days before the related death of Moses, that Reuben and Manasseh are allowed to take possession of the land which had been conquered on the east side of Jordan. We meet with those words frequently in different parts of the Bible, which have been urged, by all objectors to its authenticity, as a proof that such an observation could not have been made but by a person who had written at a date much later than the time when the circumstances are said to have happened. The Jewish Scribes, Pharisees, and Rabbies, have asserted that all



their books were written by the principal person which they relate to, such as the Pentateuch by Moses, the book of Joshua, by Joshua; the book of Judges and books of Samuel, by Samuel; and so on, whereas there is every internal proof to the contrary, that would be sufficient to satisfy the obstinate minds of the Jews and Christians on any other subject. The case is simply this, the Jews have raised their sacred books into fame by the most glaring exaggerations, and the Christians, having built their fraud upon them, are obliged to subscribe to all those exaggerations, even whilst they themselves confess to be staggered at them. I shall enter more fully into this subject after passing through Deuteronomy.

The third chapter concludes with an account of Moses asking the favour of Jehovah to be permitted to pass the Jordan, which he is refused, although Moses is here described as repeating to the Israelites what had occurred, and what they knew, yet we have not met with any such circumstance before; in fact, commentators have made it a boast, of the meekness of Moses in acquiescing in the order of Jehovah, and not expressing a wish to enter the promised land after all he had done for the Israelites. They have attempted to argue, that Moses must have been convinced of enjoying the spiritual Canaan, therefore was indifferent as to reaching the earthly Canaan! But what cannot Jews and Christian imagine? There is one thing worthy of notice which strikes me here, and that is, that Moses is represented throughout his career as speaking to the whole body of Israelites, which, according to their number is an utter impossibility, that they could be congregated and addressed as a body. In the second verse of the fourth chapter we have the following injunction:—

“Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you.”

What are we to say to our various translators of the Hebrew Bible, no two of whom have yet agreed as to the true and literal translation? Is it not too much, as I asked Chief Justice Abbott, to call upon any man to put his faith in any translation of the Bible, when every translator differs from the other as to the import and meaning of an innumerable number of words, and not only words, but whole sentences and paragraphs. But I was answered, there is the authorized version which King James and the Parliament decided should be re-

ceived in this country. I reply, that I have a conscience which cannot be satisfied, on so important a matter, upon such suspicious grounds. So, for keeping a conscience, I am to have three years imprisonment! Bravo! bravo; Christians.

In the fifth chapter we have a repetition of the decalogue, of which, I shall take no further notice, than to make a few observations on the following sentence, which I omitted to do in passing through the book of Exodus.

“For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generations of them that hate me.”

I consider this to be an abominable doctrine to teach mankind, and totally irreconcilable with the Christian precepts. To imagine that an unconscious infant is to be accountable for the sins of its parents, or parent's progenitors, is a gross and horrible idea, unsocial, unnatural, and pregnant with mischief to society. It is not sufficient that the unhappy offspring of vicious parents suffer both in body and mind from the ill consequences of the vices of their parent or parents, but they also must be loaded with the wrath and vengeance of a God? It is satisfactory that we know Jehovah to be a powerless non-entity, or this doctrine would be sufficient to distract every reflecting mind. The God of Nature has ordained that vice should carry its own reward with it, and we see that every vicious character, whose life is prolonged, becomes a misery to himself and all that are connected with him. It unfortunately happens, that the children of such a parent suffer from his conduct whilst living, and there may be instances where the ill effects of his vices extend beyond life, but as sure as the family of such a vicious parent take warning by his end, and make virtue their guide, nature holds out to them the common benefits of her produce. There is no exception, there is no distinction; she is open to the embrace of every human being, and those who reject her and seek assistance from other ideal powers, punish themselves, whilst nature is neither injured nor offended. The acme of human happiness is centred in nature and open to the approach of all mankind, who by their faculty of reason have the power of enjoying it: but alas! how much below every other animal is man: he alone rejects that, which is pre-eminently his to enjoy!

I come now to the seventh chapter of which I shall insert the two verses and follow them with a disquisition of Dr. Geddes.



"When the Lord thy God shall bring thee into the land whither thou goest to possess it, and hath cast out many nations before thee, the Hittites, and the Girgashites, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Ebusites, seven nations greater and mightier than thou; And when the Lord thy God shall deliver them before thee; thou shalt smite them and utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor shew mercy unto them."

"Nothing can be clearer than that the utter destruction of the seven Canaanite nations is enjoined in this Mosaic precept: nor was this doubted by any translator, interpreter or commentator, till toward the close of the eighteenth century. They all tell us, indeed, that it was a *reasonable*, a *necessary* command: for that "to spare such rank, incurable idolators, would have been cruelty to themselves and their posterity." Were not the Moabites, and Ammonites, and other neighbouring nations, as gross idolators as the Canaanite nations? Yet there is no injunction to utterly destroy them. It was not then the mere idolatry of the Canaanites that brought about their destruction; but their idolatry and other abominations, were made pretexts to dispossess them of their lands and properties, in order to transfer them to the Israelites. But still they allow that such a precept was given, and endeavour to justify it by reasonings, which, to me appear frivolous in the extreme, and totally repugnant to the evangelical doctrines of Christianity. It was this consideration, I doubt not, which induced some very modern writers to maintain, that such an injunction was never given!"

"Not so the candid, the learned, the liberal prelate, who wrote a short while ago, an *Apology for the Bible*. He was conscious that the fact could not be controverted; but he endeavours to justify it on principles, which at first sight seem specious; but which, in my apprehension, will not bear a minute inspection. He is astonished that the author of *The Age of Reason* should attempt to disparage the Bible by bringing forward the exploded and frequently refuted objections of Morgan, Tindal, and Bolingbroke. You profess yourself (adds he) to be a Deist, and to believe that there is a God, who created the universe and established the laws of nature, by which it is sustained in ex-

---

\* "This mode of expression, so common among controversialists, I confess I never could relish. It may be equally used, and has been used, by both parties: for nothing is more easy to say than—"Your argument has already been often answered and confuted." Bellarmine might say so to Barclay, and Barclay to Bellarmine; and, if Bolingbroke, Tindal or Morgan were now alive, they would most probably deny that their arguments had been refuted. Certainly every answer is not a refutation."

istence. You profess, that from the contemplation of the works of God you derive a knowledge of his attributes; and you reject the Bible, because it ascribes to God things inconsistent (as you suppose) with the attributes which you have discovered to belong to him: and in particular, you think it repugnant to his moral justice, that he should doom to destruction the crying or smiling infants of the Canaanites. Why do you not maintain it to be repugnant to his moral justice, that he should suffer crying or smiling infants to be swallowed up by an earthquake, drowned by an inundation, consumed by a fire, starved by a famine, or destroyed by a pestilence? The word of God is in perfect harmony with his work: crying or smiling infants are subjected to death in both. When Catania, Lima, and Lisbon were swallowed up alive, why do you not spurn, as spurious, the Book of Nature, in which this fact is certainly written, and from the perusal of which you infer the moral justice of God?"

In the Preface to the second volume of my version of the Bible (p. ii. in the note), I have said, that it grieved me to read in a late elegant *Apology*, so lame a justification of the passage in question; and added, "*I am tempted sometimes to think*, that the R. R. author must have felt the weakness of his argument, and seen the disparity of his simile." I used the words *tempted to think*, because I could not bring myself to believe that the bishop *did* feel the weakness of his argument. I am persuaded that he considered it as a strong argument: and, perhaps, what I am now going to write against it, will not move him to alter his opinion. I will, however, make an essay.

In the first place, then, I trust his Lordship will agree with me, that there is but one clear, explicit, immutable law of moral equity, implanted by the wise creator in the human mind: ALTERI NE FECERIS, QUOD TIBI NON FIERI VIS. It is this law which, independent of any revelation, tells us, that we must not steal, we must not kill, we must not injure our neighbour: and if this hold good, and be obligatory with respect to individuals, it must be equally so with regard to whole families, tribes and nations, which are composed of individuals. According to this, I believe indisputable, principle, the Israelitic nation had no more right to invade, dispossess and exterminate the Canaanites, than these had to invade, dispossess, and exterminate the Israelites. "True (it will possibly be said) in the abstract, and bating particular circumstances: but God, who is the sovereign arbiter of the world, and author of the laws of nature, whether *physical* or *moral*, may, when he pleases and sees occasion, dispense with the general moral law, ALTERI NE FECERIS, &c. and give a special positive law in direct opposition to it." I might obstinately deny this assertion,



and maintain that he could not, without being himself unjust: nor do I see what solid argument could be adduced to prove the contrary; for I presume my antagonist would hardly have recourse to the argument of tyrants: **SUCH IS OUR PLEASURE.** But, granting that an arbitrary, omnipotent being have a right to transfer my property to you, and authorise you to murder me and mine offspring for the purpose of securing that transfer; I must have strong proofs indeed of the existence of such an instrument, and of its having been issued from the chancery of heaven, before I could submit to so uncommon a dispensation of providence: and even then, I fear, it would only be a bare submission: my soul would interiorly murmur, and wonder how this could be reconcileable with the justice of that Supreme Being, who has so deeply imprinted on the tablet of my mind, the idea, that no one is to do to another, what he wishes not to be done to himself. "But what if I were an egregious sinner, who had deserved to be dispossessed of my property, and bereaved of my life?" An egregious sinner! In the estimation of whom? Not surely of you my destroyer! I should consider you as a partial judge, and might deem you as great a sinner as myself. "Not merely in my estimation (you reply), but in the estimation of God, who, knowing all things, must know, that you are a most enormous sinner, deserving death and destruction." Be it so—he has a thousand ways and means to destroy me, without employing you as an instrument—and before I believe that he has chosen you for that purpose, I must have far other proofs than your bare assertion; especially as I find that you are interested in the matter, and are to reap the fruits of my destruction. But if the order, which you say you have received from heaven, be to dispossess and destroy not only my *guilty* self, but my *guiltless* infants and posterity, I become still more astonished and more incredulous; and desire to see and peruse your commission, with the broad seal of heaven upon it:—nay, were you to produce such a commission in the name of heaven, I should insist on its being a fabrication of your own; and that it could not come from the same God who says, *that children shall not be punished for the sins of their fathers.*

Now, as we have no other proof that God commanded Moses and his Israelites (who themselves were so sinful a people, that he often threatened to destroy them) to dispossess and extirpate the Canaanite, man, woman, and infant, than the bare assertion of an Hebrew historian. Suppose it even to be Moses himself—the Canaanites must have necessarily considered the god of Moses as an unjust god; or believed that the pretended command to dispossess and exterminate them, was a counterfeit. We are then, I think, warranted to say, that it is infinitely more probable that God never gave such an order, so opposite to the general law of moral equity, than that he dispensed with this law, in favour of a particular nation, with

‘ respect to the Canaanites, however great their sins, or grievous their  
 ‘ abominations, which, by the bye, we know only from the same  
 ‘ partial interested pen, that has recorded the decree of their pro-  
 ‘ scription.

‘ I cannot help dwelling yet a little longer on this topic. Suppose  
 ‘ yourself, my Lord Bishop of Llandaff, to be living in the quiet pos-  
 ‘ session of your own estate in Westmoreland; and then suppose me  
 ‘ to be a Gallican refugee bishop; escaped from the tyranny of Ro-  
 ‘ bespierre, and the fangs of French Atheism. Were I, in this suppo-  
 ‘ sition, to claim your inheritance, under the pretext that I had a spe-  
 ‘ cial commission from God, to dispossess and extirpate you and your  
 ‘ race, would you not call in question the veracity of the document?  
 ‘ Would you tamely submit to be despoiled of your life and fortune,  
 ‘ and not try to repel force by force? In vain might I allege, that  
 ‘ you were a grievous sinner, a vile obstinate heretic, an enemy to  
 ‘ God and his spouse, the church; and on that account, meriting ex-  
 ‘ termination; you would, with indignation, deny the charge; and  
 ‘ perhaps retaliate, and call me, in return, a superstitious idolater.—  
 ‘ Deem not this a jocular argument. I mean it as a very serious  
 ‘ one.

‘ The Chanaanites were in much the same predicament, when  
 ‘ they were invaded by the Israelites, as your lordship would  
 ‘ be, if invaded by a Romish fugitive bishop: nor am I very sure, but  
 ‘ that the Romish bishop could produce even more plausible argu-  
 ‘ ments for the expulsion and perdition of an English heretic, than  
 ‘ the Israelites could bring for expelling and extirpating the ido-  
 ‘ latrous Chanaanites. At least, he would not fail to make use of the  
 ‘ command to exterminate the Chanaanites, as a divine precedent,  
 ‘ which he might safely follow; and in this he would do no more than  
 ‘ has been done, not only by the religionists of Rome, but by those  
 ‘ of all other denominations, when they had a mind to persecute and  
 ‘ proscribe those of a different creed. And this naturally leads me to  
 ‘ take notice of the Bishop’s simile; which, in my opinion, halts ex-  
 ‘ ceedingly.

‘ When the earthquake swallows up, the sea overwhelms, the fire  
 ‘ consumes, the famine starves, or the plague destroys, we are totally  
 ‘ ignorant by what law of nature, or concatenation of causes, the de-  
 ‘ solating events happen. We see only the dismal effects; and no  
 ‘ consequence can rationally be deduced from them, against the prin-  
 ‘ ciple of moral equity, so often before mentioned. From such events,  
 ‘ no one could derive an argument for the lawfulness of dispossessing  
 ‘ or injuring his neighbour, either in his property or person; no ar-  
 ‘ gument for the lawfulness of burying alive idolaters, drowning here-  
 ‘ tics, starving atheists, &c. &c. From such events, the famous Bishop  
 ‘ of Cagliari, Lucifer, could never have inferred, that it was the duty  
 ‘ of the orthodox to kill the Arians; and even the Emperor Constan-



'tius, who abetted the Arianism.\* From the earthquakes at Catalina, Lima, Lisbon, the Holy Inquisition could never have concluded that it was lawful and meritorious to burn the bodies and confiscate the goods of Moors, Jews, and wicked infidels. But the express command of God to extirpate whole nations on account of their sins, and to transfer their goods and chattels to another chosen people, was a precedent exactly suited to their sanguinary purposes; and triumphantly employed by them to obviate all objections, on the score of cruelty.

'The same inferential arguments were made use of in the Valdesian persecution; and indeed in every persecution for the sake of religion, since persecution began. The supposed divine commission given to the Jews, to extirpate the Chanaanites and Amalekites, has ever been in the mouth of Judaizing Christians—a positive and plausible plea for committing the most cruel injustices.

'On the whole, then, I must repeat it; I cannot possibly believe, that ever a just, benevolent Being, such as I conceive my God to be, gave such a sanguinary order to Moses and the Israelites, as in the book of Deuteronomy he is said to have given. Let others think otherwise:—I will not quarrel with them on that account; nor shall I again return to the subject on any provocation.'

There is no need of it, Doctor—you have handled this subject well. Another objection to the Bishop's quibble might be made; and that is, that the earthquakes which he mentions as destroying "crying and smiling infants," were natural effects of natural causes; and such as no power could prevent nor foresee. The causes of an earthquake are not visible on the surface of the earth: it arises either from the congregation of inflammable matter, or the exhaustion of combustible matter. In the first instance, the congregated body of inflammable matter must, and will, find vent somewhere, which I consider, causes the least terrific kind of earthquakes. In the second place, the exhaustion of combustible matter, such as issues forth from volcanoes, must frequently produce the more destructive kind of earthquakes, so as to fill up the vacuity that such ignited matter had occasioned by its exhaustion. All this is a part of the general law of nature, such as ever has been, such as ever will be. I have no idea that a "crying or smiling infant," is of more consequence in the general law

---

\* See his five Declamations against the Emperor, in the fourth volume of *Bibliotheca Patrum*; or in the 8vo. edition of Paris, 1568. This work was highly applauded by the Athanasian party, who considered him as the organ of the Holy Ghost, on this occasion, without whose special assistance, (they said) he could never have so well understood, and so properly applied the texts of holy writ!

of nature, than the worm, the spider, or any other insect that is crushed by the foot of man, or by any other intended or accidental cause. Man has fashioned certain notions to himself of a God, and every man's notions differ from those of his fellow; still, every one fancies himself to be right, and madly endeavours to render the works of nature, subservient to his narrow and idiotic views.

!!! It does not become man to say that God is this, or God is that; no man can say what he is, and he who attempts to tell another that God is this or that, that he has ordained this or that, is an impostor, and ought to be scouted as long as he retains such notions. Nature is God, and God is Nature; and he who quits Nature in search of a God, is an idolater. The Jews were as much idolaters as the Chanaanites, and the Christians are equal to both. Almost all religion, that we know to have been practised, has been one and the same species of idolatry. What matters it, whether a man fashions a certain similitude with his hands, or with his brain, if he worships it as a God? The idolatry is the same, and the ideas of the one idolater are just the same as the other; both are unconnected with reason or nature. Man is the only being that inhabits the earth, in whom nature hath implanted the perfect faculty of reason; and man is the only being that has made his reason a fantastic thing, and set it above its creator. Every other animal seems to follow the undeviating path of nature save man, and he having filled his mind with the most strange idolatry, has the audacious ignorance impiously to arraign and reject the dictates of nature, by saying, that they proceed from *mere human reason*! And thus destroys all his happiness by sponging this *mere human reason* from his mind, and rejecting the dictates of nature, in congregating the gross and sensual idea, that he is an immortal being, and destined to enjoy eternal bliss, in exchange for the rejection of that bliss, which nature infallibly holds out to him.

(To be continued.)